



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

17575 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill CA 95037 (408) 778-6480 Fax (408) 779-7236
Website Address: www.morgan-hill.ca.gov

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

AUGUST 25, 2009

PRESENT: Koepp-Baker, Escobar, Hart, Moniz, Mueller, Tanda

ABSENT: Liegl

LATE: None

STAFF: Community Development Director (CDD) Molloy Previsich, Senior Planner (SP) Tolentino, Associate Planner (AP) Golden, and Minutes Clerk Johnson

Chair Tanda called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., requesting Commissioner Koepp-Baker to lead the pledge of allegiance to the U.S. flag, with all present being invited to join in.

DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

Minutes Clerk Johnson certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Tanda opened, and then closed, the floor to public comment for matters not appearing on the agenda as none were in attendance indicating a wish to address such matters. .

MINUTES:

August 11, 2009

COMMISSIONERS MUELLER/ESCOBAR MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 11, 2009 MINUTES WITH THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS:

Page 7, Paragraph 4:~~LPS~~ **LOS**....

Page 7, Paragraph 7:~~decisionmakers~~ **decision makers**....

Page 11, Paragraph 4:if we add another 600 then the 2020 population numbers should be much lower **another 600 then the number of allocations per year after 2015 would be lower.**"

THE MOTION PASSED (5-0-1-1) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: ESCOBAR, HART, MONIZ, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: KOEPP- BAKER, as she had not been present at the meeting; ABSENT: LIEGL.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 2

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1) ZONING AMENDMENT, ZA- 09-04: CITY OF MORGAN HILL AMENDMENT TO SEISMIC COMBINING DISTRICT CHAPTER 18.43 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE:

Amendment to the Seismic Combining District of the Morgan Hill Municipal Code to implement the California Seismic Hazard Zone mapping project and to comply with the California Geological Survey requirements for evaluating seismic hazards in Morgan Hill.

CDD Molloy Previsich presented the staff report, noting that this item had been noticed for public hearing; however, she explained, because this matter requires more comprehensive stuffy by staff, it was requested that the issue be tabled to a future meeting.

Commissioner Escobar asked, “Are we to interpret that this will not be on the next Planning Commission meeting agenda?” [Yes]

Chair Tanda opened, and then closed, the public hearing as here were none present to speak to the matter during open session.

COMMISSIONERS MUELLER/ ESCOBAR MOTIONED TO TABLE THE MATTER OF ZONING AMENDMENT, ZA-09-04: CITY OF MORGAN HILL AMENDMENT TO SEISMIC COMBINING DISTRICT CHAPTER 18.43 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE. THE MOTION PASSED WITH THE UNANIMOUS AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF ALL COMMISSIONERS PRESENT; LIEGL WAS ABSENT.

2)ZA-06-18: HALE- SIGNATURE PROPERTIES:

A request for approval of a General Plan Amendment for an approximately 30 acre parcel between Hale Ave and Monterey Rd, south of Tilton Ave from “Public Facilities” to “Single Family Medium” (3 to 5 units per acre). The project also requests approval of a zoning amendment from Public Facilities to Single Family R-1 7,000. A Mitigated Negative Declaration is proposed. (APN 764-09-012)

AP Golden gave the staff report, noting that this request was for both General Plan and zoning amendments on the subject property. AP Golden said the project site had been annexed to the City in 2002, when a project (private high school, subsequently withdrawn) had been planned. Now, he said, no other activity for the parcel had been indicated. AP Golden offered explanation of the land uses surrounding the property, and stated this is one of the ‘transition’ sites in the City. It would be possible to have up to 150 dwellings on the site. While it would be possible for that amount of density, the applicants have proposed 120 units – but not yet submitted a specific site plan. Madrone Parkway will run through the center of the property. AP Golden went on to provide an overview of the required findings associated with the request.

AP Golden also referenced the Initial Study which had been completed and resulted in a Mitigated Negative Declaration, together with a Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

Responding to questions, AP Golden explained that the draft Environmental Impact Report for the city’s proposed Circulation Element Amendment proposes changing

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 3

the planned Madrone Parkway from four at-grade lane facility to two grade-separated lanes, and the developer's plans can accommodate either of those configurations (either the existing General Plan or the future amendment if adopted). The developer also understands the potential need for future environmental assessments once tentative map and design permit applications are filed.

Commissioner Escobar referenced the staff report as he spoke of the discussion about the City Council reconsidering zoning based on net vs. gross acreage and asked if the applicant had been notified of that potential? AP Golden advised that he had spoken with the applicant regarding the new General Plan single family high category and potential change of using net density rather than gross density.

Commissioner Koepp-Baker asked for clarification of uses for Madrone Parkway if Tilton was kept open. CDD Molloy Previsich spoke to the issue of the Circulation Element wherein that Study has now answered the question of whether Madrone Parkway is needed. CDD Molloy Previsich explained that, "Madrone Parkway is needed but it doesn't need to be four lanes, only two. If in the long term, more use comes into being, there will need to be a grade separation. With the applicant's conceptual plan, Madrone Parkway will bi-sect the site and allowances have been made for that by the developer."

Chair Tanda asked, "If it becomes necessary to trade out an at-grade crossing for Madrone Parkway, which one are you thinking of?" CDD Molloy Previsich responded that the issue was not germane to this discussion, but in the future, and with further analysis, perhaps San Pedro.

Chair Tanda opened the public hearing.

Joe Zawidski, 4672 Willow Rd., Suite 200; Pleasanton, Vice President of Signature Properties for planning projects, addressed the commissioners and complimented staff for the 'good job'. Mr. Zawidski presented a brief background of the proposed use of the property, including the annexation for the previously proposed private high school. Mr. Zawidski said his firm is working to have residential dwellings on the site, and envisions 7,000 sf lots. "This is only the first step before anything is approved," he said. "At this point, the only change will be General Plan and Zoning land use designation. We will be working on more definite plan, and with the next RDCS competition we plan to submit an application for allotments. This action will provide the right to apply for allotments. As AP Golden said there are advantages and the site is well-located in having residential to the north and south of this site."

With no others in attendance indicating a wish to speak to the matter, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Escobar reiterated that the property site was annexed in 2002 and within the City's Sphere Of Influence prior to that time. "What was the anticipated zoning previous to 2002?" he asked. AP Golden responded, "There was no zoning but a General Plan designation of Single Family Medium density, just as is now being requested."

Commissioner Mueller recalled, "The only way the property came into the City was

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 4

a change to declare the site as 'Public Facilities' in the General Plan. At that time it was not annexed to the City as residential. The Archdiocese carried it long way but finally decided it was not an appropriate location for the school."

Commissioner Koepp-Baker clarified that 'we are actually going back to what the City planned for the area before the General Plan change to Public Facilities.'

COMMISSIONERS MUELLER/ESCOBAR MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.

For the benefit of the students present, Chair Tanda provided clarification as to what was being debated at this meeting: what the Commissioners were looking at was bare land about the size of the local high school(s). Consideration was being given regarding the recommended land use category for future development, and the Commission develops a recommendation that will publicly will go forward to the City Council. Chair Tanda reminded the audience that there would be a number of future additional opportunities for public review and participation, before the site actually gets developed, but tonight's action starts the process of allowing future residential development. "Homes will be built as result of actions this night," he said. Commenting further, Chair Tanda said, "EIR, CEQA, SOI: this is jargon of planning terms we deal with to follow the rules of the State and protect the interest of the public.

THE MOTION PASSED (6-0-0--1) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: KOEPP-BAKER, ESCOBAR, HART, MONIZ, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: ABSTAIN; NONE; ABSENT: LIEGL.

COMMISSIONER MUELLER OFFERED A RESOLUTION, INCLUSIVE OF THE FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN, RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO AMEND THE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF A 30-ACRE PARCEL BETWEEN HALE AVE. AND MONTEREY RD. FROM PUBLIC FACILITIES TO SINGLE FAMILY MEDIUM. COMMISSIONER ESCOBAR PROVIDED THE SECOND TO THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED (6-0-0--1) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: KOEPP-BAKER, ESCOBAR, HART, MONIZ, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: ABSTAIN; NONE; ABSENT: LIEGL.

COMMISSIONER MUELLER OFFERED A RESOLUTION APPROVING A ZONING DISTRICT AMENDMENT TO AMEND THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF A 30-ACRE SITE LOCATED BETWEEN MONTEREY RD. AND HALE AVE FROM PUBLIC FACILITIES TO R1-7,000, SINGLE FAMILY MEDIUM DENSITY. COMMISSIONER ESCOBAR NOTED THE FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS CONTAINED WITHIN AND PROVIDED THE SECOND TO THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED (6-0-0--1) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: KOEPP-BAKER, ESCOBAR, HART, MONIZ, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: ABSTAIN; NONE; ABSENT: LIEGL.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 5

3) USE PERMIT,
UP-09-05:
TENNANT-
AAMCO:

A request for approval of a conditional use permit to operate an AAMCO Transmission Shop, a major automotive repair business, in an existing industrial building located at 235 Tennant Avenue in the ML, Light Industrial zoning district. A Mitigated Negative Declaration is proposed. (APN 817-04-030)

Disclosure: Commissioner Mueller announced he had met with the applicant of the next agendaized item prior to the meeting tonight.

SP Tolentino provided an overview of the request, and explained the plan for operating an AAMCO Transmission Shop in an existing industrial building in the ML, Light Industrial Zoning District on Tennant Ave. "Because AAMCO Transmission is considered a major automotive repair business, approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) is required to have the business operate in the ML district," SP Tolentino said. She went on to explain the building size, parking spaces, and former use of the site.

SP Tolentino reminded, too, that findings are required for issuance of a CUP, and in this instance included factors of:

- parking spaces - numbers and configuration. Applicant has asked for reduced parking based on recommendation from new AAMCO company manual: transmission repair work is the business focus so fewer parking spaces needed
- 6 bays within building are proposed
- current building to accommodate 2 roll-up doors

Regarding parking, Commissioner Koepp-Baker asked if the applicant had indicated vehicles under repair would be kept in the building at night? [Yes]

Other Commissioners provided questions and concerns of:

- because of unique configuration of building, was staff looking at parking differently [only for this use at this location]; if no longer used as AMMCO, then CUP back to Planning Commission for review of other use
- balance of square footage for space to balance of business
- different configuration of business shape to provide access to individual workers to bays (4 bays angled and two tandem), and to provide for some vehicle storage within the building

Commissioner Hart asked if there were any conditions right now that will cause increased traffic to the site. [Unknown, but if business increases, could increase stress on parking] Commissioner Hart asked if this should be addressed in the prepared Resolution? SP Tolentino advised the Commissioners could condition the Resolution thusly. Commissioner Mueller reminded that the CUPs can be called up if staff recognizes a specific need, using an example of a request for more bays, or noncompliance with conditions of approval.

CDD Molloy Previsich stated, "If staff begins receiving numerous complaints, then the CUP can be called up for review. If the Commissioners want specific language, such as having the CUP called up due to undue levels of traffic or inadequate parking to serve demands from its customers, that can be put in the Resolution."

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 6

Commissioner Escobar asked, "If are a significant number of complaints, and if language is not in the Resolution, wouldn't that trigger staff to bring the CUP back to the Commissioners?" CDD Molloy Previsich responded, "It would not be typical to review a CUP based on the success of a business, but a condition of approval could be worded to highlight limits of this business, and to put the operator on notice that if the city receives some number of complaints within a set timeframe, then the CUP could come to the Planning Commission for review for potential change."

Chair Tanda opened the public hearing.

Kevin Bladow, 1700 Union Heights Road, Hollister, told the Commissioners he was a proponent for the request as he is the business owner. Mr. Bladow also noted that Joe Wolfe, AAMCO Corporate Vice President of Real Estate, and Mark Sanchez real estate agent were in attendance. Mr. Wolfe joined Mr. Bladow at the podium.

Commissioner Escobar referenced the staff report which indicated the business of vehicle transmission. "However," Commissioner Escobar said, "I've been hearing on the radio that the transmission business is your greatest amount, but your recent ad campaign emphasizes oil changes. What percentage of other things do you work on in comparison to the transmission work?"

Mr. Wolfe replied, "The Company had found that when customers bring in their cars for transmission, they frequently ask if we can do other stuff, e.g., oil changes? So we have now brought in workers who can do other things at same time as transmission work is being completed. About 15% of our business is other than transmission work. Transmission is about \$2,300 and an oil change \$23. We can't do much more than transmission work as we restricted by the nature of the business. In order to do more oil changes, we would have to do 100 for each transmission, and that would require a much have larger building as our main focus will remain transmission work.

Commissioner Escobar said, "Then your intent is to limit the business and not expand beyond 15% of extra type work?" [Yes]

Commissioner Mueller asked, "Of that 15% extra type work, how much is not associated with transmission repair?" Mr. Wolfe answered, "Minimal: 1 - 2%. We want to be thought of as a place to get your transmission fixed."

Commissioner Escobar noted, "We are just trying to clarify: when you are advertising other types of service, it seems you are trying to build other business in addition to the transmission work." Mr. Wolfe reiterated that transmission work remains the focus of the Company. Commissioner Mueller commented, "So if you have the ability to do other work, the business will do it." Mr. Wolfe said, "The main concentration will be on transmission-only work." Commissioner Escobar commented, "Your radio ads states: if your engine light goes on go to AMMCO." Mr. Bladow clarified that the local AMMCO will diagnose problems and perhaps make referrals to other companies for other work. "Our emphasis is: we are here for

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 7

the public to assist you (even if we don't do all of the work)."

Chair Tanda asked if the 15 parking spaces include employee parking. Mr. Bladow responded, "Yes, and a shop this size typically has three employees." Chair Tanda requested clarification of the application for space for 6 bays if only two techs are working." Mr. Bladow explained that in transmission work, the vehicle can't be taken off the lift and put some place else. "So 50% of the bays are tied up at all times," he said.

Chair Tanda asked if there were a number of repairs anticipated in a week [16] Mr. Wolfe said that one of three transmission repair inspections result in either the customer does or does not need a repair. "Parts and supplies are a minimal part of the business," he said. "We generally don't advertise oil changes as a business because it is a 'business killer'. It works out that one transmission service is equal to 100 oil changes."

Mr. Bladow said he made the estimates provided to the City before receiving Corporate information, and said, "That error was on my part. The Corporate numbers are sensitive with publicity."

Commissioner Moniz asked for an estimate for opening. Mr. Bladow said he had set a target open date for October 2009. Mr. Bladow told what was needed for completion for an opening.

Commissioner Mueller observed: "When I met with you, you were deciding on exterior painting. What did you decide? Mr. Bladow said he had not fully made the decision. "I would like to but the signage procedure is at AMMCO. If we do any new painting, it looks like maybe off white with maybe a red and blue stripe."

With no others in the audience indicating a wish to speak to the matter, the public hearing was closed.

COMMISSIONERS MUELLER/ESCOBAR MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM. THE MOTION PASSED (6-0-0--1) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: KOEPP-BAKER, ESCOBAR, HART, MONIZ, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: ABSTAIN; NONE; ABSENT: LIEGL.

HAVING NOTED THE REQUIRED FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS THERETO, COMMISSIONER MUELLER OFFERED A RESOLUTION APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE AN AAMCO TRANSMISSION SHOP, A MAJOR AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR USE, IN AN EXISTING BUILDING LOCATED AT 235 TENNANT AVE. IN THE ML, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT, WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION:

Addition of a Whereas: this CUP is specific to the AAMCO business model; consequently there is a direct impact on parking and site use.

CDD Molloy Previsich suggested **add(ing) language to section 3, noting a**

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 8

determination for a CUP for specific use at this location.

Commissioner Mueller agreed with the substitute language, *withdrawing the request for the Whereas*, and continued:

Addition to Exhibit A /A 1 (a): this CUP is only for this AMMCO dealership, and can contain six bays; should AMMCO discontinue operations at this location, the CUP back to Planning Commission for review

Addition to Exhibit A / Additional Conditions section 6 (d): Should there be report of a significant number of complaints, e.g., parking, traffic; the CUP will be returned to the Planning Commission for review.

COMMISSIONER ESCOBAR SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED (6-0-0--1) BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: KOEPP-BAKER, ESCOBAR, HART, MONIZ, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: ABSTAIN; NONE; ABSENT: LIEGL.

WORKSHOPS:

4)DISCUSS **PROPOSED** **CIRCULATION** **ELEMENT** **GENERAL PLAN** **AMENDMENT:**

The purpose of this workshop is for the Planning Commission to become familiar with and work toward understanding the Public Draft General Plan Circulation Element Update.

CDD Molloy Previsich recalled that discussion of this item had been started at the last meeting, when staff had reviewed the distributed memo and gave an explanation of the process. "Now it is time for your questions," she announced.

Items discussed included questions and concerns raised by Commissioners:

Escobar: Clarify LOS based on possible narrowing of Monterey Road between Main and Dunne.

CDD KMP: Under the Current General Plan (with no citywide changes of circulation network and with Monterey Road at 4 lanes), LOS on the road segment between Main and Dunne in Year 2030 is LOS D. This is the same as under the Current General Plan with Model-Recommended Network: that segment of Monterey between Main and Dunne would be LOS D. If Monterey Road is narrowed to 2 lanes, as assumed under the Cumulative General Plan Amendment Scenario then LOS falls to F.

At the Main/Monterey intersection, under any scenario the current LOS standard of D+ cannot be met; that intersection is currently operating at LOS D; it falls to E+ in AM peak and D in PM peak under Current General Plan with existing planned road network in 2030; and it falls to E in AM and D in PM under Current General Plan with Model-Recommended Network; and falls to LOS F in both AM and PM peak under Cumulative General Plan Amendment Scenario with Monterey Road narrowed to 2 lanes.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 9

CDD Molloy Previsich advised, "Under any scenario, at Main/Monterey intersection there is a lower LOS than today's General Plan standard." She continued by saying that the proposed exemption of downtown from the LOS standard is based on emphasis of having downtown be a 'human place' rather than widening intersections and so forth to accommodate vehicles passing through. Exempting the downtown means that future developments will not need to identify further mitigation measures to make improvements to accommodate cars -- a LOS F downtown means the City does not plan for further widening of downtown streets.

Escobar: One of the possible mitigations under the Monterey Road Narrowing identifies the possibility of keeping Monterey four lanes between Dunne and 5th, in order to achieve LOS D+ at the Dunne/Monterey intersection, but isn't this counter to the proposed narrowing itself?

CDD Molloy Previsich noted that the EIR recognizes this, and does characterize the LOS D at Dunne/Monterey as a 'significant unavoidable impact' under the "Project Alternate – Monterey Road Narrowing Scenario". However, the EIR suggested that the City study that possibility if it further considers the narrowing option.

It is not urgent to make any Monterey Road Narrowing decision, and we may want to first carry out a streetscape alternatives planning process, but the good thing is that we now have a lot of information about what would happen if that occurs, and we do have appropriate CEQA documents.

Also, not all of the intersections that were initially *proposed* and were studied for a lower LOS standard of E or F actually turn out to be projected at that level (ie. they are projected to have higher LOS), so it may be that we keep a higher standard for some facilities.

Mueller: The traffic studies are based on projections for 2030, not "build-out", and the traffic model doesn't allow U-turns, and projected LOS downtown may be better than we think, because as presently shown, going out 4th and 5th would be the only way out; but if we connect Depot to Church at the traffic light, it could be significantly different. "I suggest we reroute through the parking lot." It will be important to keep Depot open even with rerouting.

CDD Molloy Previsich: "The proposal essentially says that downtown development should not have to seek mitigation of intersections. Developers will pay Citywide traffic impact fees but would not be required to do a traffic study. City staff and the consultants like the idea of re-routing Depot to connect to Church at the parking lot; however we don't believe it will change the projected LOS F's at the Monterey/4th and Monterey/5th intersections, which happen by 2030 under any future scenario, not just Monterey Road Narrowing. But those intersections do not meet signal warrants, and are not considered significant impacts.

Escobar: What we are hearing is that we may alleviate some problems; but not fully remove LOS F, which may be advantageous, as now have developers must do additional EIRs if mitigations aren't available or desirable, and this would be avoided under the new downtown LOS policy standard.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 10

Mueller: But we need to be careful - at build-out, traffic could get ugly; at some point, there could be need to revisit the issue and we might find there is need for traffic studies. Air quality could be another problem.

CDD Molloy Previsich stated that the downtown is not like suburban areas; we plan to use large parking lots and other structures and lots to provide 800 spaces for downtown in peripheral or underground locations by 2030 to meet projected development. We envision people parking, then walking to experience downtown.

Mueller: I don't think most people will walk 3 - 4 blocks. And if we get a lot of people living downtown, there is no way to accommodate parking.

CDD Molloy Previsich stated that residential developments must supply on-site parking; off-site parking is only allowed for non-residential uses.

Koepp-Baker: Expressed worry about residents walking, parking, shopping

Escobar: We may have to confront the issue that dwellings downtown may not work in the same way as most housing. As we face the necessity of balancing residents and visitors, it occurs to me if we have to shift priorities, we will have to shift to serving visitors rather than residents. I suggest we look at other downtowns that may be prospering that have a mixed use along with residential: what are their densities and traffic levels of service? We may need to examine the number of residents that downtown can accommodate considering both traffic and air quality.

Mueller: Asked about location of potential parking for Third and Depot Streets

CDD Molloy Previsich: The Community and Cultural Center parking lot might be best for a larger parking structure; the city lots between the UPRR and Depot Street also offer potential for structured parking.

Escobar: From a residential standpoint, that location might be difficult for residents

Discussion: Peak time driving, parking, walking ~ may be difficult for residents

CDD Molloy Previsich stated that residential developments must supply on-site parking; off-site parking is only allowed for non-residential uses.

Moniz: Reconfiguration of Depot to Church - how many spaces reduced and cost of that; what will be impact on Hale

CDD Molloy Previsich: That is a level of detail that would be worked out at a project stage.

Tanda: Draft EIR, table 12-7 (page 66) 2030 General Plan -- worst case scenario for 2030 for traffic impacts?

CDD Molloy Previsich would have to compare to cumulative; might vary but on page 72, table 3.2-9 likely is worst case, but depends on intersection.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 11

Tanda: My concern for Main/Monterey intersection: if we can't get through an intersection, then people will seek an alternate: then they will not live or go downtown, so that is a sensitivity as people do not generally want to go if the LOS F are on the side streets, and they cannot access the main streets. "Essentially abandoning the LOS means it will be treated as though it is an F. Please ask the traffic consultant if, at a two-minute delay, the typical traveler who does not live downtown would go to downtown."

CDD Molloy Previsich: we believe they would try to find an alternate route and that is why having Depot as an alternate route is important. She also spoke of the possible link of Depot north to McLaughlin.

Escobar: have we considered or anticipated alternative routes with two purposes in mind: going through town and having a primary route to downtown

CDD Molloy Previsich confirmed support by staff and the Consultants for preserving Depot Street connection to Dunne.

Escobar: if we are saying that using Depot as an alternative way to downtown, then access to parking would be complementary?

Mueller: it would depend on how people were coming in to town, there are limited left turns: Main, Second, 4th

Koepp-Baker: using Depot does open up parking, and encourages parking for downtown. It appears we haven't encouraged that model yet.

CDD Molloy Previsich that is reason why the City bought the lot on Depot; this will be a second parking lot, and that is why the Circulation Element Amendment studies retaining the connection of Depot to Dunne (the existing General Plan Circulation Element plans to close it off when the UPRR grade separation project occurs).

Koepp-Baker: those two Depot lots will offer parking for visitors. It is incumbent on us as a City to tell developers to provide at least 500 parking spaces for 500 dwelling units. The City needs to provide the parking as 75% of the people will have to be transported by car to get in and out.

CDD Molloy Previsich: as to downtown housing types, developers will do studies and the housing types will unfold; but the policy question for the City is how the downtown looks and feels, how it will be different from a suburban place and have downtown vitality. Then it will be up to different people who choose to live in the downtown housing type. Developers will respond to market demand.

The need to comply with CEQA was stressed with regard to the alternative LOS standards for various intersections. CDD Molloy Previsich stated that under the Current General Plan 2030 Scenario (existing Downtown Plan), the City projects about 600 new dwelling units downtown, and about twice that under the proposed Downtown Specific Plan, and LOS levels don't meet the existing LOS standard

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 12

even under the Current General Plan Scenario.

Tanda: Concerns in general - LOS of D, and negative; higher level of concern - do we need mitigation at E but not F? End result of designing for environment where heavy traffic is predicted would be a concern.

Mueller: Looking for alternative way to do circulation, but also way to do first 3 - 4 projects downtown; would like to see when the south side of Main and Monterey begins to develop. Would like to have 'trigger' for causing action to improve that intersection; may have to have LOS at that location for several years rather than have intersection degrade to lower LOS

Tanda: We are still identifying the problem but not a solution

CDD Molloy Previsich: Without the LOS Policy change, that means the City considers each downtown development project step-by-step, with traffic studies at at each step. This will constrain development and feasibility.

Koepp-Baker: We have to accommodate up to 500 units; we must plan for that many.

Mueller: with Measures A and F, the City has already allocated projects in 800 - 900 range

Mueller: with the downtown having up to 600 units, where are the extra units? once we get above 600 and with the current allocations

CDD Molloy Previsich: 300 will have to go through RDCS; we're really not talking about a whole lot more allocations needed; this is to 2030 and will have to evaluate as we go to see if the current EIR is still valid or if we need to do additional CEQA work. Some of intersections may be D or D+, not E or F; downtown is critical

Escobar: Part of what Commissioner Mueller is asking: at least look as to alternative E at certain intersections, with overriding factors

Tanda: A concern: as development occurs somebody is ensuring an appropriate evaluation of the impact on the traffic system. We may go too far and have infrastructure inadequate with people not buying. From an engineering standpoint, many are at F, the questions is: have we done enough analysis?

CDD Molloy Previsich: not every single intersection downtown is studied; of those studied (un-signalized) a signal warrant analysis was performed

Tanda: Signal warrants are for professionals; if the study doesn't meet the standards, the warrants would be precluded, but we may want signals for better flow. There could be very few LOS Fs - it might be well to identify what could be done for modifications to those; we can still make improvements even if warrants aren't met and even if LOS standard is F.

CDD Molloy Previsich: we can look at the intersections with E and F and see if

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2009

PAGE 13

variations are needed

Tanda: we may not be saying we want to remain at F

Mueller: at some point in our discussions, we need to walk through all the text language changes. It is suggested that just the proposed Circulation Element Text Amendment be reviewed at a September 15th Study Session for Planning Commissioners.

CDD Molloy Previsich the changes will show in your binders as strike-outs and insertions of new text.

5)DISCUSS PROPOSED DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN:

The purpose of this workshop is for the Planning Commission to become familiar with and work toward understanding the Public Draft Downtown Specific Plan released in July 2008. Upon adoption, the Downtown Specific Plan will replace the 2003 Downtown Design Plan and will provide the General Plan land use designations and policies, as well as the zoning map and development standards for downtown.

The in-depth nature of the preceding workshop precluded continuation of further discussion.

The Commission indicated that it was satisfied with its previous study sessions on the Downtown Specific Plan and EIR, and so the next session before the Planning Commission would be after the Final EIR is available, at a formal publicly-noticed public hearing.

ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMISSIONER IDENTIFIED ISSUES

- recommendations of the Planning Commission regarding the General Plan single family high designation will be considered at the August 26th Council meeting.

CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

- Councilmembers directed staff to develop a policy for RDCS extensions; work on the 'pros and cons' has been undertaken, and it may come before the Planning Commission as well

ADJOURNMENT

Noting that there was no further business for the Planning Commission at this meeting, Chair Tanda adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

MINUTES RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

JUDI H. JOHNSON, Minutes Clerk